| | tase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 1 | 67 Filed 06/06/25 Page 1 of 2 |
|---|---|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | ΓES DISTRICT COURT |
| 10 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 11 | FRESNO DIVISION | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | DORA SOLARES, | 1:20-CV-00323-LHR |
| 14 15 16 | Plaintiff, v. | NON-PARTY CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION'S NOTICE AND PRIVILEGE LOG RE: PLAINTIFF'S SUBPOENA DIRECTED |
| 17 | RALPH DIAZ, et al., | TO THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL |
| 18 | Defendants. | Date: June 24, 2025 |
| 19 | | Time: 11:00 a.m. Courtroom: Videoconference |
| 20 | | Judge: The Honorable Lee H. Rosenthal |
| 21 | | Action Filed: March 2, 2020 |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | On May 23, 2025, the Court ordered non-party California Department of Corrections and | |
| 24 | Rehabilitation (CDCR) to review documents gathered by the California Office of the Attorney | |
| 25 | General (OIG) in response to a subpoena in this matter and provide a privilege log as to | |
| 26 | documents generated by CDCR. (Minute Order, ECF No. 162.) CDCR asserts privileges as | |
| 27 | shown in the attached privilege log. | |
| | II | |

Case 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 167 Filed 06/06/25 Page 2 of 2

CDCR notes that OIG's access to the documents listed in the attached privilege log does not result in a waiver of privilege. By statute, CDCR is required to allow OIG access to its documents, but allowing that access does "not result in the waiver of any confidentiality or privilege regarding any records or property." Cal Penal Code § 6126.5.

In addition, access to Jaime Osuna's mental health records by CDCR personnel for purposes of a confidential investigation into potential staff misconduct does not waive psychotherapist-patient privilege. That privilege can be waived only by the actions of the privilege holder (in this case Osuna). *See, e.g., Jaffee v. Redmond,* 518 U.S. 1, 15 n..14 ("Like other testimonial privileges, *the patient* may of course waive the protection." (emphasis added)); *In re Jakubaitis,* 604 B.R. 562, 573 (9th Cir. BAP 2019) (describing the two types of possible waivers of the privilege, express waiver by the patient, whether explicit or through disclosure, and implied waiver by the patient's assertion of claims); *Alatorre v. Mabus,* 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46090, *7-8 (S.D. Cal. 2015) (no waiver of privilege based on therapist's failure to assert privilege in response to subpoena). Restricted access for the purpose of employee oversight is permitted under HIPAA, including under 45 CFR 164.512(d).

18 Dated: June 6, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ROB BONTA Attorney General of California JON S. ALLIN Supervising Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Jeremy Duggan
JEREMY DUGGAN
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Defendants
California Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation

SA2019101902 39076528.docx